DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 803 EA 010 671

AUTHOR Parks, James Richard
TITLE An Assessment of In-Service Training Needs of Elementary Administrators. A Topic of Study.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Educational Needs; Elementary Education; *Inservice Education; *Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Glendale Elementary District AZ

ABSTRACT

The problem addressed in this topic of study was that of identifying the inservice training needs of 26 administrators in the Glendale (Arizona) Elementary District and ranking those needs in order of importance. It was assumed that by ranking topic areas according to the number and percentage of responses a priority list of inservice training needs could be determined. The priority list then could serve as a guide to the implementation of an inservice program. An analysis of the data suggests that there is a definite need for training in each of the 17 topic areas. However, the data did provide information that can serve as a guide to establishing training priorities. Additional conclusions that can be drawn from the data suggest that preservice training may not provide elementary administrators with the skills necessary to address contemporary issues or to meet contemporary administrative evaluation procedures and that future needs assessments should contain specific areas of need rather than general topic areas and should be designed to address each administrative position being surveyed. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED155803

AN ASSESSMENT OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING NEEDS OF ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Richard Parks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Topic of Study

Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Western Colorado University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
in
Administration and Supervision

---

by
James Richard Parks

December 1977

EA 010 671

WESTERN COLORADO UNIVERSITY
P.O. Box 2102
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

APPROVAL OF THE TOPIC OF STUDY

Candidate: James R. Parks Date: December 30, 1977

Degree: Doctor of Education Advisor: H. Earl Heusser, Ed.D.

Area of Specialization: Student, Staff, and Public Relations

Proposed Title: An Assessment of In-Service Training Needs of Elementary Administrators

The following professors have agreed to serve as the Graduate Committee for the above named candidate and have approved this proposal. The candidate's advisor will be chairman of the committee.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN: H. Earl Heusser, Ed.D.
Name
H. Earl Heusser
Signature

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Michael L. Hensley, Ph.D.
Name
Michael Hensley
Signature

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jose G. Rabanal, Ph.D.
Name
Jose' G. Rabanal
Signature

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to H. Earl Heusser, Ed.D., Graduate Committee Chairman, and to members of the Graduate Committee, Mr. Hadley A. Thomas, Superintendent, and all administrative staff members of the Glendale Elementary District, whose interest and assistance made this project possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
	STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE	2
	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	3
	DEFINITION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS	3
	LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS	4
2.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
	INTRODUCTION	5
	A VIEW OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING	5
	CHANGE	6
	NEED AND IMPORTANCE	7
	RESPONSIBILITY FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING	7
	THE FIRST STEP--A NEEDS ASSESSMENT	9
	SUMMARY	10
3.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	11
	SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS	11
	DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT	12
	DATA COLLECTION	12
4.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	14

Chapter Page

PRESENTATION 14

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS 18

5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY 30

CONCLUSIONS 30

RECOMMENDATIONS 31

SUMMARY 32

BIBLIOGRAPHY 34

APPENDIXES 36

A. INTRODUCTORY LETTER 37

B. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT 39

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Responses to Topic Items	15
2.	Percentage of Responses by Topic Areas	16
3.	Rank Order of Topic Areas	17

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of administrators in the Glendale Elementary District has, traditionally, been accomplished through an informal verbal agreement between supervisor and employee which resulted in either a recommendation for issuance of a new contract or dismissal.

During the month of August, 1977, twenty-six administrators of the district were called together for a two-day orientation by the newly appointed superintendent. The primary purpose of the orientation was to present a new procedure for the evaluation of administrators--evaluation based on the attainment of objectives directly related to district goals.

As each administrator addressed the objectives that he or she would be responsible for attaining, the same question was raised: "How can I be evaluated on the basis of objectives without the skill necessary to attain those objectives?"

This question resulted in several answers, ranging from university coursework to in-service training, with the

latter being the most popular due to such factors as geographical distance from the universities, availability of nighttime courses, and time considerations.

It was the consensus of the administrators that, in order to meet their individual objectives, it would be necessary to implement an immediate in-service training program.

Just what initial steps must be taken to design and implement the in-service training program needs further exploration.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem was one of identifying the in-service training needs of twenty-six administrators in the Glendale Elementary District and ranking those needs in order of importance.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to conduct "an assessment of in-service training needs for elementary administrators" in the Glendale Elementary District as the first step in implementing an ongoing in-service training program.

It was anticipated that the needs assessment and ranking of needs would facilitate the immediate implementation of an in-service training program, thereby providing

administrators with the necessary skills vital to accomplishing objectives which serve as the basis for administrative evaluation.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Upon the completion of this project, the learner:

1. Developed a written assessment instrument by compiling topic information from the Arizona Department of Education as evidenced by the completion and approval of the instrument (page 28);
2. Conducted and completed the assessment by distributing and collecting 100 percent of the assessment instruments (p. 18);
3. Used an objective approach to determine immediate in-service training needs by ranking responses for each topic area, as evidenced by a List of Tables (pp. 15-17);
4. Summarized, analyzed, and drew conclusions from the data collected, as evidenced by recommendations presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

DEFINITION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS

The following definitions are applicable to this project:

Administrator--as used in this project, refers to: (1) assistant superintendent(s), (2) administrative assistant, (3) personnel director, (4) director of curriculum, (5) coordinators, (6) principals, (7) assistant principals.

Needs assessment--as used in this project, refers to a determination of what exists and what should exist.

Problem--as used in this project, refers to a need that is of sufficient importance to merit an attempt at resolution.

LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Limitations

The project is limited as follows:

1. The project is limited to one phase of in-service training, that of a needs assessment.

2. The project is limited to ranking in-service training needs on the basis of importance.

Delimitations

The project is delimited as follows:

1. The project was concerned only with administrators of the Glendale Elementary District, Maricopa County, Arizona.

2. No attempt was made to determine the basis for needs of individuals involved in the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The term "in-service training" has appeared for some time in educational literature. Some groups and individuals have preferred other terms, such as "in-service education," "continuing education," or "professional growth activities." Whatever the designation, there appears little argument concerning the need, importance, responsibility, and initial steps.

A VIEW OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Harris (1963:67) has defined in-service training as "a task aimed at changing people that they might improve the learning experiences of students." In drawing a parallel with the public relations task, Harris stated:

> Public relations seeks to accomplish changes in people for precisely these same ends--improved learning experiences. The distinction between the two programs is in the groups of people that are the focus of the supervisory activities.

If we accept the view presented by Harris, then it would seem logical that we should determine if there is common agreement that a need for bringing about a change in school administrators exists and why it may be needed and important.

CHANGE

Pharis (1968:43) referred to the importance of change when he stated that:

> Inservice education helps the administrator remain an open person--one who continues to receive, interpret and evaluate new information or restructure old information into new and meaningful patterns of response.

Burnes (1975:74-76) presented the results of a two-year pilot project designed to explore the extent to which in-service training of principals would result in change in their schools. The project focused on staff development with the assumption that in-service training would result in the principals seeing new dimensions to their role, acquiring new competencies, and continuing their professional zeal to learn which then would result in a change in their teachers. At the end of the project participants were asked to identify significant changes in their schools. All participants reported that as they developed additional skills in staff development there was a change in climate and morale.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE

There appears to be no disagreement that in-service training is important and that a need exists.

In Chapter 1 it was noted that there were many new issues and problems facing today's school administrators. This, of course, is not a current dilemma. In 1966 Wilson (1966:47) stated:

> Because of the rapid additions to knowledge and issues in all fields and the scrutiny being given to teaching methods, educators will not long find their preservice training adequate. To maintain their professional status, educators must regularly participate in many types of inservice education programs.

During this same year Howsana (1966:28) presented a paper at the University Council of Education Administrators wherein he suggested that 10 to 20 percent of an administrator's time should be devoted to in-service training.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Gross and Herriott (1965:154) have addressed the question of responsibility by recommending that:

> Instead of viewing training as primarily the responsibility of colleges and universities, school districts may find it profitable, as do many business establishments, to assume considerable responsibility themselves for training and development of executive personnel.

In terms of fiscal responsibility, Lutz and Reynolds (1972:4) have suggested that educational institutions follow the lead of American business in spending increasingly greater amounts on in-service staff development. They

further propose that, in percent of total expenditures devoted to in-service programs, American business corporations allocate approximately ten times the amount to in-service training as do educational institutions. Although fiscal support does not directly justify in-service training for elementary administrators, it would appear that if the field of business places this amount of credence in its importance then educational institutions should not ignore it.

It would appear that local school districts must, out of necessity, assume the responsibility for in-service training as colleges and universities have traditionally concentrated on the preservice training of school administrators. This conclusion was supported in part by Rodgers (1972:24) in a presentation of the results of a study conducted by the American Association of School Administrators. The results indicated that institutions of higher learning concentrated their resources on preservice education and did little for the continuing professional education of school administrators.

In further support of this conclusion, Crooks (1975: 75) stated that "institutions of higher education and other program development agencies have done a minimum to provide inservice training for principals."

Although school districts may not be required to furnish in-service training programs, they may do well to accept the premise, set forth by Bruce (1976:35), that "the

success of an educational enterprise depends primarily on the quality of leadership."

THE FIRST STEP--A NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The first step in developing an in-service training program is to determine if indeed needs exist and if so how such needs compete with each other for priority.

One way of determining if a need exists is to develop a questionnaire, submit it to the target population, and thus identify which among a number of topics generates the most interest. Stoops and Rafferty (1961:24) hold that the operation of a program of in-service training "cannot be conducted without identifying the needs of the target population for which it is designed and the questionnaire is appropriate to this task."

Davis (1976:10) stated that, with relatively few exceptions, most recent needs assessments questionnaires dealt with specific topics due to the relatively small groups of learners, which made it easier to tailor the programs. His one criticism of the topic-oriented needs assessment was that it determines little beyond the topics, such as what participants will find most attractive or educationally profitable.

The topic-oriented questionnaire has the additional advantage of being able to determine needs in a relatively short period of time.

SUMMARY

The term "in-service training" has often been referred to as "in-service education," "continuing education," and "professional growth." Whatever the term used, its importance is not denied. One way of defining in-service training is to look at it as "a task aimed at changing people that they might improve the learning experiences of students."

As noted previously, the importance of in-service education is undeniable, largely due to the many issues and problems facing today's administrator which demand that he or she be as well trained as possible.

The responsibility for in-service training must be accepted by the schools as institutions of higher learning devote their resources to preservice education.

The logical first step in the development of an in-service training program is the needs assessment. For a small target population, the topic-oriented questionnaire is a rapid way of determining needs.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the selection of participants, the needs-assessment instrument, procedures used in data collection, and the techniques utilized to analyze the data.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The population involved in this project consisted of twenty-six administrative staff members of Glendale Elementary District No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona. Specifically, the population included:

1. The superintendent,
2. The assistant superintendent for instructional services,
3. The assistant superintendent for business services,
4. The administrative assistant for federal programs,
5. The director of curriculum,
6. The director of personnel services,
7. The coordinator of special education services,

8. The coordinator of bilingual education,
9. Three (3) elementary curriculum coordinators,
10. Ten (10) elementary principals,
11. Five (5) elementary assistant principals.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

The Arizona Department of Education, Division of Administrative Services, provided, on the basis of requests for technical assistance, seventeen topic areas recommended for use in determining administrative in-service training needs.

The use of these topic areas served to facilitate the project's completion and implementation of the in-service training program.

DATA COLLECTION

A cover letter (Appendix A) with its attached instrument (Appendix B) conveyed the following information:

1. Reason and purpose for the assessment,
2. Potential value of the project,
3. Sponsoring agency or agencies,
4. Name and title of the person responsible for the assessment,
5. The date for return.

Data gathered from the individual assessment forms are summarized and ranked by number of responses for each

item. Results are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3 of Chapter 4. The ranking of responses by number and percent is used as it provides the information needed for this particular project.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

PRESENTATION

The problem was one of identifying the in-service training needs of the administrators in the Glendale Elementary District and ranking those needs in order of importance.

The population consisted of twenty-six elementary administrators from the Glendale Elementary School District, No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona.

The procedure for collecting data was the distribution of a questionnaire, containing seventeen topic areas, to each administrator. The qustionnaire contained a scale ranging from "Most Important" to "No Importance." This scale was used to allow for varying degrees of response to each topic area.

Responses from each questionnaire were then tabulated and are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 1 indicates the number of responses for each topic area. Table 2 lists the percentages of responses by topic areas. Table 3 shows the rank order of the topic areas.

Table 1

Responses to Topic Items

Topic Area	No. of Responses	Relative Importance				
		Most	Somewhat	Undecided	Little	No
1. Laws, court decisions, and compliance	26	21	5	0	0	0
2. Personnel evaluation and staff development	26	17	9	0	0	0
3. Program evaluation	26	14	7	0	5	0
4. Curriculum velopment models	26	5	8	3	10	0
5. Educational planning	26	19	7	0	0	0
6. Decision-making skills	26	18	8	0	0	0
7. Staff selection and dismissal ..	26	14	2	0	7	3
8. Alternative delivery models ..	26	7	9	0	10	0
9. Self-management.	26	20	4	0	2	0
10. Staff motivation	26	16	8	0	2	0
11. Human relations skills	26	15	8	0	3	0
12. Public relations responsibilities	26	13	7	0	6	0
13. Parent involvement	26	10	10	0	6	0
14. Budgeting skills	26	16	4	0	6	0
15. Communication skills	26	17	6	0	3	0
16. Organizational patterns and policies	26	9	4	0	10	3
17. Negotiations ...	26	12	6	2	3	3

Table 2

Percentage of Responses by Topic Areas

Topic Area	Relative Importance				
	Most	Some-what	Un-de-cided	Lit-tle	No
1. Laws, court decisions, and compliance	81.00	19.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Personnel evaluation and staff development	65.00	35.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Program evaluation .	54.00	27.00	0.00	19.00	0.00
4. Curriculum development models	19.23	30.77	11.54	38.46	0.00
5. Educational planning	73.00	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6. Decision-making skills	69.00	31.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7. Staff selection and dismissal	53.85	7.69	0.00	26.92	11.54
8. Alternative delivery models	27.00	34.00	0.00	39.00	0.00
9. Self-management	77.00	15.00	0.00	8.00	0.00
10. Staff motivation ...	61.00	31.00	0.00	8.00	0.00
11. Human relations skills	57.69	30.77	0.00	11.54	0.00
12. Public relations responsibilities ...	50.00	27.00	0.00	23.00	0.00
13. Parent involvement .	38.46	38.46	0.00	23.08	0.00
14. Budgeting skills ...	61.54	15.38	0.00	23.08	0.00
15. Communication skills	65.38	23.08	0.00	11.54	0.00
16. Organizational patterns and policies .	34.62	15.38	0.00	38.46	11.54
17. Negotiations	46.15	23.08	7.69	11.54	11.54

Table 3

Rank Order of Topic Areas

Rank Order	Topic Area
1	Laws, court decisions, and compliance
2	Self-management
3	Educational planning
4	Decision-making skills
5	Communication skills
6	Personnel evaluation and staff development
7	Budgeting skills
8	Staff motivation
9	Human relations skills
10	Program evaluation
11	Staff selection and dismissal
12	Public relations responsibilities
13	Negotiations
14	Parent involvement
15	Organizational patterns and policies
16	Alternative delivery models
17	Curriculum development models

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The purpose of this project was to conduct "an assessment of in-service training needs for elementary administrators" as the first step in implementing an ongoing in-service training program in the Glendale Elementary District. It was anticipated that the assessment would result in identifying needs and ranking them in terms of their relative importance to administrators.

As stated earlier in this chapter, the procedure for collecting data was the distribution of a questionnaire, containing seventeen topic areas. Each topic area provided responses ranging from "most" to "no" relative importance. This scale was used to allow for varying degrees of responses.

There was a 100 percent return for the twenty-six questionnaires distributed. Each of the seventeen topic areas received a response from all participants. A decision was made to rank the topics according to the combined totals and percentages falling in the "most" and "somewhat" important columns.

An analysis and interpretation of the results for each topic area is presented below:

Topic Area No. 1--Laws, Court Decisions, and Compliance

Analysis. Topic Area No. 1 was ranked number 1 in Table 3, as twenty-one of the respondents, or 81.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance, and five respondents, or 19.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important, for a total of twenty-six responses, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of awareness of contemporary issues in the topic area; or (2) a lack of ongoing in-service training.

Topic Area No. 9--Self-Management

Analysis. Topic Area No. 9 was ranked number 2, as twenty respondents, or 77.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Four respondents, or 15.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important. Two respondents, or 8.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. The responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) Increased workloads requiring additional skills such as time management; or (2) the lack of

adequate preservice or in-service training; or (3) the two respondents who identified the topic as having "little" importance may either be skilled in self-management or in a position wherein this skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 5--Educational Planning

Analysis. Topic Area No. 5 was ranked number 3, as nineteen of the respondents, or 73.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance, and seven respondents, or 27.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important, for a total of twenty-six respondents, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or in-service training; or (2) increased workloads requiring additional planning skills.

Topic Area No. 6--Decision-Making Skills

Analysis. Topic Area No. 6 was ranked number 4, as eighteen of the respondents, or 69.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance, and eight respondents, or 31.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important,

for a total of twenty-six responses, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or in-service training in decision-making skills.

Topic Area No. 15--Communication Skills

Analysis. Topic Area No. 15 was ranked number 5, as seventeen respondents, or 65.38 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Six respondents, or 23.08 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important. Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. The respondents totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or in-service training; (2) the three respondents who identified the topic as having "little" importance may have this skill or be in a position where the skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 2--Personnel Evaluation and Staff Development

Analysis. Topic Area No. 2 was ranked number 6, as seventeen respondents, or 65.00 percent of the population,

identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance, and nine respondents, or 35.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important, for a total of twenty-six responses, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice and inservice training; (2) this skill is becoming increasingly important due to the legal impact teacher organizations are having on the district; (3) the lack of a comprehensive personnel evaluation procedure; (4) the lack of ongoing procedures for staff development in the district.

Topic Area No. 14--
Budgeting Skills

Analysis. Topic Area No. 14 was ranked number 7, as sixteen of the respondents, or 61.54 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Four respondents, or 15.38 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Six respondents, or 23.08 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) The lack of adequate preservice or inservice training; (2) building adminitrators being given more responsibility for developing program and unit budgets;

(3) those respondents who identified the topic area as having little importance may be in a position where the skill is not needed or required, or they may possess the skill.

Topic Area No. 10--
Staff Motivation

Analysis. Topic Area No. 10 was ranked number 8, as sixteen of the respondents, or 61.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Eight respondents, or 31.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Two respondents, or 8.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or in-service training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic area as having "little" importance may either possess the skill or be in a position where the skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 11--Human
Relations Skills

Analysis. Topic Area No. 11 was ranked number 9, as fifteen of the respondents, or 57.69 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Eight of the respondents, or 30.77 percent of the

population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or inservice training; (2) the respondents who identified the topic area as having "little" importance may currently possess this skill.

Topic Area No. 3--
Program Evaluation

Analysis. Topic Area No. 3 was ranked number 10, as fourteen respondents, or 54.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Seven respondents, or 27.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Five respondents, or 19.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or inservice training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic area as having "little" importance may currently possess this skill or are in a position where the skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 7--Staff Selection and Dismissal

Analysis. Topic Area No. 7 was ranked number 11, as fourteen respondents, or 53.85 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Two respondents, or 7.69 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Seven respondents, or 26.92 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "no" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice and in-service training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic areas as having "little" or "no" importance may currently possess this skill or be in a position where the skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 12--Public Relations Responsibilities

Analysis. Topic Area No. 12 was ranked number 12, as thirteen respondents, or 50.00 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Seven respondents, or 27.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Six respondents, or 23.00 percent of the population,

identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or inservice training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic as having "little" importance may currently possess this skill or be in a position where the skill is not needed or required.

Topic Area No. 17--
Negotiations

Analysis. Topic Area No. 17 was ranked number 13, as twelve respondents identified the topic as having the "most" relative importance. Six respondents, or 23.08 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Two respondents, or 7.69 percent of the population, were "undecided." Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. The last three respondents, 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "no" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or inservice training; (2) no interpretation was made by respondents who were undecided; (3) those respondents who

identified the topic area as having "little" or "no" importance may currently possess the skills, be in a position where the skill is not needed or required, or fail to see the skill as their area of responsibility.

Topic Area No. 13--
Parent Involvement

Analysis. Topic Area No. 13 was ranked number 14, as ten respondents, or 38.46 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Ten respondents, or 38.46 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat" important. Six respondents, or 23.08 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice or in-service training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic area as having "little" importance are most likely in a position where this skill would not be needed or required.

Topic Area No. 16--Organizational Patterns and Policies

Analysis. Topic Area No. 16 was ranked number 15, as nine respondents identified the topic as having the "most" relative importance. Four respondents, or 15.38 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewhat"

important. Ten respondents, or 38.46 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "no" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of ongoing in-service training; (2) since organizational patterns and policies govern all administrative functions it is difficult to interpret these responses unless an assumption is made that the topic area was too general in nature.

Topic Area No. 8--Alternative Delivery Models

Analysis. Topic Area No. 8 was ranked number 16, as seven respondents, or 27.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as having the "most" relative importance. Nine respondents, or 34.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as being "somewht" important. Ten respondents, or 39.00 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of adequate preservice and in-service training; (2) those respondents who identified the topic areas as having "little" importance may currently

possess the skill or feel this area is not a function of their position.

Topic Area No. 4--Curriculum Development Models

Analysis. Topic Area No. 4 was ranked number 17, as five respondents, or 19.23 percent of the population, identified this topic as having the "most" relative importance. Eight respondents, or 30.77 percent of the population, identified the topic as "somewhat" important. Three respondents, or 11.54 percent of the population, were "undecided." Ten respondents, or 38.46 percent of the population, identified the topic as having "little" importance. Responses totaled twenty-six, or 100 percent of the population.

Interpretation. (1) A lack of preservice or in-service training; (2) no attempt was made to interpret those responses identified as "undecided"; (3) those respondents who identified the topic area as having "little" importance may currently possess the skill, be in a position where the skill is not needed or required, or do not see this topic area as their function.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

CONCLUSIONS

The problem addressed in this topic of study was one of identifying the in-service training needs of twenty-six administrators in Glendale Elementary District No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona, and ranking those needs in order of importance.

It was assumed that, by ranking topic areas according to the number and percentage of responses, a priority list of in-service training needs could be determined. The priority list then could serve as a guide to the implementation of an in-service program for administrators.

An analysis of the data suggests that there is a definite need for in-service training in each of the seventeen topic areas. However, the data did provide information which can serve as a guide to establishing training priorities.

Additional conclusions which may be drawn from the data suggest that:

1. The preservice training of elementary administrators may not provide them with necessary skills to address contemporary issues.

2. The preservice training of elementary administrators may not be adequate in providing skills necessary to meet contemporary administrative evaluation procedures.

3. Future needs assessments, utilizing the questionnaire method, should contain specific areas of need rather than general topic areas which may suffer due to interpretation.

4. Future needs assessments, utilizing the questionnaire method, should be designed to address each administrative position being surveyed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that, as a result of this project, an in-service training program for elementary administrators be implemented to address each topic area in sequence.

It is further recommended that the Board of Trustees, Glendale Elementary District No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona, adopt a policy whereby the in-service training of administrators is an ongoing process.

In addition, in-service training needs of elementary administrators must also be communicated to institutions of higher learning in order that they might consider these topic areas in administrative courses.

Finally, it is recommended that a management plan be developed to provide for a systematic and ongoing in-service training program for elementary administrators in the district.

SUMMARY

The problem addressed in this topic of study was one of identifying the in-service training needs of twenty-six administrators in the Glendale Elementary District and ranking those needs in order of importance.

The purpose of the project was to conduct an assessment of in-service training needs for the twenty-six administrators in Glendale Elementary District No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona, as the first step in implementation of an ongoing in-service program.

The procedure for collecting the data was distribution of a questionnaire encompassing seventeen topic areas related to school administration. The questionnaire provided responses ranging from "most" to "no" relative importance. This scale was used to allow for varying degrees of responses.

The project was limited to one phase of in-service training, that of a needs assessment, and specifically related to ranking in-service training needs on the basis of relative importance.

The project concerned itself with a small population of administrators from Glendale Elementary District No. 40, Maricopa County, Arizona. No attempt was made to determine the basis for needs of individuals involved in the study.

The solution of the problem of identifying the in-service training needs of elementary administrators in the Glendale Elementary District does not specifically correlate with other projects or research found in educational literature. The assessment does, however, correlate with other assessments found in that it was limited to a small population, conducted by the questionnaire method, and was topic-oriented.

Results of this project indicate a definite need to provide in-service training as a continuing process of improving the skills of elementary administrators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blackstone, Peggy L., and Patrick Lynch. Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 027-597, 1966.

Bruce, C. A. "A Program for Preparing Principals," Education Canada, XVI (Spring, 1976), 35.

Crooks, J. B., and others. "In-Service for Educational Leadership," National Elementary Principal, LV (November, 1975), 75.

Davis, William J. Inservice Staff Development Programs for School Principals: Needs Assessments and Inservice Programs. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 119 304, February, 1976.

Ferranti, Reynolds, and Frank W. Lutz. Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators. New York: University Council for Education Administrators, 1972.

Gross, Neal, and Robert E. Herriot. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Pharis, William L. "Look Over Your Shoulder: The Need for Continuing Education in a Changing Society," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (May, 1968), 43.

Rogers, David. Preparation for the School Superintendency. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1972.

Stoops, Emery, and M. L. Rafferty, Jr. Practices and Trends in School Administration. New York: Ginn and Company, 1961.

Wilson, Robert E. Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

School District No. 40 of Maricopa County, Arizona

GLENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

5734 West Glendale Avenue, Glendale, Arizona 85301

December 10, 1977

Dear Administrator:

Your assistance is needed in a district-wide project that I am conducting to:

1) Assess the in-service training needs of administrators in the Glendale Elementary District.

2) Partially fulfill the requirements for the Doctorate in Education Administration and Supervision, Western Colorado University, Grand Junction, Colorado.

The potential value of this project is that it will provide the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees with information which may be used to develop an ongoing in-service training program for administrators in our district.

The attached instrument itself has been pretested by the Arizona Department of Education, Division of Administrative Services, and has been approved by the Superintendent for use in our district.

It is necessary that the Needs Assessment Questionnaire be completed and returned to my office by December 25, 1977.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jim Parks
Assistant Principal
S.E.S.
Unit I School

APPENDIX B

NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: There are seventeen (17) general topic areas of school administration on this instrument. Please indicate the degree of importance, to you, for in-service training by placing a circle around the number assigned to each level. Double-check your responses to be certain that you have circled a response for each topic area.

Topic Area	Relative Importance				
	Most	Somewhat	Undecided	Little	No
1. Laws, court decisions, and compliance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Personnel evaluation and staff development	1	2	3	4	5
3. Program evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
4. Curriculum development models	1	2	3	4	5
5. Educational planning	1	2	3	4	5
6. Decision-making skills ...	1	2	3	4	5
7. Staff selection and dismissal	1	2	3	4	5
8. Alternative delivery models	1	2	3	4	5
9. Self-management	1	2	3	4	5
10. Staff motivation	1	2	3	4	5
11. Human relations skills ...	1	2	3	4	5
12. Public relations responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
13. Parent involvement	1	2	3	4	5
14. Budgeting skills	1	2	3	4	5
15. Communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
16. Organizational patterns and policies	1	2	3	4	5
17. Negotiations	1	2	3	4	5